



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/004,971	12/03/2001	Syed M. Ali	16159.023001; P6425	7806
32615	7590	02/16/2006	EXAMINER TRUONG, LECHI	
OSHA LIANG L.L.P./SUN 1221 MCKINNEY, SUITE 2800 HOUSTON, TX 77010			ART UNIT 2194	PAPER NUMBER
DATE MAILED: 02/16/2006				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/004,971

Applicant(s)

ALI ET AL.

Examiner

LeChi Truong

Art Unit

2194

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12/07/2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 3, 4- 6, 8-13, 16, 18, 19, 20-24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 3, 4- 6, 8-13, 16, 18, 19, 20-24 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.


WILLIAM THOMSON
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1, 3, 4-6, 8-13, 16, 18, 19, 20-24 are presented for the examination. Claims 2, 7, 14, 15, 17, 25, 26 are cancelled.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1, 3-5, 6, 8-9, 12, 13, 16, 18, 19, 20-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sumsion et al (US. Patent 6,496,865 B1) in view of Glass (US. Patent 6,947,965 B2).

3. **As to claim 1**, Sumsion teaches the invention substantially as claimed including: a system having distributed collaborating systems (a distributed network, col 1, ln 10-14), restricting direct interaction between distributed collaborating (col 2, ln 57-67/col 4, ln 60-67), a application-independent interface (a redirector, col 1, ln 40-46/col 4, ln 5-10/ln 60-67/the resource access system 108/an interpreter system 202, col 7, ln 45-65/ col 8, ln 55-67/col 11, ln 9-18), an application-independent interface between distributed collaborating systems(col 11, ln 9-18/col 1, ln 40-55/col 2, ln 10-20), a service(the client redirector 306, col 11, ln 9-18), invoking a service from the application-independent interface in order to enable interaction

between distributed collaborating components(col 11, ln 9-19), sending a usage specification to the application independent interface (col 4, ln 60-66).

4. Sumsion does not explicit teach usage specification as an argument, the systems as components, the usage specification comprises a server object and plurality of attributes associated with the server object that are requested by the first distributed collaborating component from the second distributed collaborating component, the application is configured to interpret the usage specification to determine the plurality of attributes to fetch from the second distributed collaborating component, obtain the plurality of attributes from the second distributed collaborating component and provide the first distributed collaborating component with the plurality of attributes. However, Glass teaches an argument (the arguments for the requested method, col 13, ln 42-45/ col 12, ln 1-10), components (component, col 1, ln 24-25/ an object in a first/ second computer, col 1, ln 34-37), the usage specification comprises a server object and plurality of attributes associated with the server object that are requested by the first distributed collaborating component from the second distributed collaborating component (a request, or message, from client application 108 passed as it proceeds to server object 110. The messages sent between client application 108 and server object 110 may include a method invocation. The method invocation. The method invocation is a request form client application 108 to invoke a particular method on server object 110 and may include the server object name, the method name or number to be invoked, and any other arguments or data needed by the invoked method, col 12, ln 1-10), the application is configured to interpret the usage specification to determine the plurality of attributes to fetch from the second distributed collaborating component (forwards the arguments to a streamer object (to be discussed in the following section) corresponding to the

Art Unit: 2194

invoked method for encoding the arguments into a format corresponding to reference object 106 to server-side ORB 114, col 13, ln 45-53/ col 14, ln 15-25), obtain the plurality of attributes from the second distributed collaborating component and provide the first distributed collaborating component with the plurality of attributes(Sever-side ORB 114 receives and decodes the arguments and then passes it to the remote proxy 154. Remote proxy 154 then makes the result and passed it to the remoter proxy 154. Remote proxy 154 then makes the result available to the client application 108, col 13, ln 55-59/ col 15, ln 54-57).

5. It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Sumsion and Glass because Glass's usage specification as an argument, components would improve the efficiency of Sumsion's system by reducing computer program storage requirements to optimize performance for communication between client and server.

6. **As to claim 3**, Sumsion teaches the application independent interface has a capability to interpret the usage specification at runtime (col 1, ln 40-46/col 3, ln 18-25/col 4, ln 5-10/ln 60-67 / col 7, ln 45-65/ col 8, ln 55-67/col 11, ln 9-18).

7. **As to claim 4**, it is an apparatus claim of claim 1; therefore, it is rejected for the same reason as claim 4 above. In additional, Sumsion teaches the invention substantially as claimed including: a system having distributed collaborating systems (a distributed network, col 1, ln 10-14), restricting direct interaction between distributed collaborating (col 2, ln 57-67/col 4, ln 60-67), a application-independent interface (a redirector, col 1, ln 40-46/col 4, ln 5-10/ln 60-67/the resource access system 108/an interpreter system 202, col 7, ln 45-65/ col 8,ln 55-67/col 11, ln 9-18), an application-independent interface between distributed collaborating systems(col 11, ln

Art Unit: 2194

9-18/col 1, ln 40-55/col 2, ln 10-20), a service(the client redirector 306, col 11, ln 9-18), invoking a service from the application-independent interface in order to enable interaction between distributed collaborating components(col 11, ln 9-19), sending a usage specification to the application independent interface (col 4, ln 60-66), and Marcos teaches a logic execution specification as an argument(the method and argument from the message, col 4, ln 53-55/ the message using the argument supplied by the client object col 7, ln 10-15), components (component object model, col 6, ln 35-39/ ln 45-49).

8. As to claim 5, it is an apparatus claim of claim 3; therefore, it is rejected for the same reason as claim 3 above.

9. As to claim 6, it is apparatus claim of claim 1; therefore, it is rejected for the same reason as claim 6 above.

10. As to claim 8, Sumsion teaches fetching data from the object based on the specification (col 7, ln 8/ col 10, ln 19-24/ln 60-67 and col 12, ln 60-65).

11. As to claim 9, Sumsion teaches storing data fetched from the server in a proxy for the object (col 10, ln 48-50).

12. As to claims 12, 13, Schofield teaches the logic execution specification comprising logic for invoking a method of an object on the server (col 2, ln 31-37).

13. As to claim 16, it is an apparatus claim of claim 6; therefore, it is rejected for the same reason as claim 6 above.

14. As to claims 18, 19, Sumision teaches fetching data from the object based on the usage/ updating data in the object based on the usage (col 13, ln 42-48).

Art Unit: 2194

15. As to claims 20, 21, 23, they are apparatus claims of claims 12, 13, 5; therefore, they are rejected for the same reasons as claims 12, 13, 5 above.

16. As to claim 22, it is an apparatus claim of claim 1; therefore, it is rejected for the same reason as claim 1 above. In addition, Sumison teaches a server object component having at least one object (resources on the server node 251, col 8, ln 57-58).

17. As to claim 24, it is an apparatus claim of claim 1; therefor, it is rejected for the same reason as claim 1 above. In addition, Sumsion teaches a application-independent interface (a redirector, col 1, ln 40-46/col 4, ln 5-10/ln 60-67/the resource access system 108/an interpreter system 202, col 7, ln 45-65/ col 8, ln 55-67/col 11, ln 9-18), interpreting a specification (col 1, ln 40-46/col 3, ln 18-25/col 4, ln 5-10/ln 60-67 / col 7, ln 45-65/ col 8, ln 55-67/col 11, ln 9-18), client sends the specification (col 1, ln 40-45), a server component that interacts with the service means in order to provide service to the client component(col 11, ln 62-67).

18. Claims 10, 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sumsion et al (US. Patent 6,496,865 B1) in view of Glass (US. Patent 6,947,965 B2) and further in view of Admitted Prior Art (APA).

19. As to claims 10, 11, Sumsion, Glass do not teach updating data in the object/ modifying the attribute of the object. However, APA teaches updating data in the object/ modifying the attribute of the object (page 2, ln 25-28).

20. It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Sumsion, Glass and APA because APA's updating data in

the object/ modifying the attribute of the object would increase the flexibility of Sumsion, Marcos and Schofield's systems by allowing modifications to distributed application to take effect without bringing the servers down.

Response to the argument

21. Applicant's arguments filed 12/07/2006 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. Applicant amended the claims. Glass's reference meets the amended claims.

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Conclusion


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to LeChi Truong whose telephone number is (571) 272 3767. The examiner can normally be reached on 8 - 5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Thomson, William can be reached on (571) 272 3718. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIP. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIP system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197(toll-free).

LeChi Truong

February 13, 2006


WILLIAM THOMSON
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER